

MEMBER STATE NARRATIVE 2016 (Version 2 – 8 november 2018)

1. General information on any changes in trends observed since the previous reporting period.

Compared to 2015 (565.884 animals used), there is a decrease of 5.46 % in the number of animals used for scientific purposes in 2016 (534.991 animals used).

2. Information on significant increase or decrease in use animals in any of the specific areas and analysis of the reasons thereof.

The use of animals in the specific areas is similar to the figures of 2015.

3. Information on any changes in trends in actual severities and analysis of the reasons thereof.

There were no significant changes in actual severities.

4. Particular efforts to promote the principle of replacement, reduction and refinement and its impacts on statistics if any.

- **Funding of research projects for the development of alternative toxicity tests.**
- **Collaboration with the university board to promote the development and promotion of alternative methods.**
- **Collaboration between the different regions and other member states to promote the 3R principle.**

5. Further breakdown on the use of "other" categories if a significant proportion of animal use is reported under this category.

40.12% of the fishes are reported under the “other” category. They are mostly Cyprinidae, Cichlidae, Salmonidae, Percidae, Soleidae, Pleuronectidae and Aplocheilidae.

37,28% of the amphibians reported under the “other” category are mostly Ranidae (Lithobates catesbeianus), Salamandridae (in order of importance: Lissotriton helveticus, Pleurodeles waltl, Ichthyosaura alpestris) and Bombinatoridae (Bombina orientalis).

14.65% of the birds are reported under the “other” category. They are Paridae, Fringillidae, Meleagrididae, Phasianidae, Passeridae, Pycnonotidae, Estrildida, Laridae, Columbidae and Psittacidae.

6. Details on cases where the 'severe' classification is exceeded, whether pre-authorized or not, covering the species, numbers, whether prior exemption was authorised, the details of the use and the reasons why 'severe' classification was exceeded.

There were no cases in which the ‘severe’ classification was exceeded.